



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/025,155 02/18/98 CRAGUN

B R09-97-195

EXAMINER

TM01/0122

ANDREW J DILLON
FELSMAN BRADLEY GUNTER & DILLON
SUITE 350 LAKEWOOD ON THE PARK
7600B NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY
AUSTIN TX 78731

BULLOCK JR. I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED:

01/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MAILED

JAN 19 2001

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 13

Application Number: 09/025,155
Filing Date: 02/18/1998
Appellant(s): B. Cragun

Michael R. Barre
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 10/16/2000.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

Art Unit: 2151

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 28-48 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) *Claims Appealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

6,011,537

SLOTZNICK

01/04/2000

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2151

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 28-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

SLOTZNICK (US 6,011,537)

As to claim 28, SLOTZNICK teaches a method for automatically swapping application tasks (display of primary data and secondary data) running within a local network site of a computer network when access from the local network site to a remote network site is delayed, the method comprising:

initiating, from a communications application (window/process displaying primary data) at a local network site (client), a link (request for primary data) to a remote network site (remote source) while multi-tasking applications (window/process displaying secondary information) are simultaneously running at the local network site (background);

initiating retrieval of data from the remote network site, in response to initiating the link (click a link / make a request for more primary data);

automatically switching focus from the communications application (window/process displaying primary data) to one of the multi-tasking applications (window/process displaying secondary data), in response to initiating the link;

determining, after focus has been switched from the communications application (window/process for displaying primary data), that the data has been retrieved (second primary data received); and

Art Unit: 2151

automatically, providing user notification that the data has been retrieved, in response to the determination (switch focus to new primary data / icon / button) (Col. 23, line 33-Col. 24, line 9; Col. 25, line 43- Col. 26, line 18; Col. 34, lines 13-26; Col. 34, lines 64-67; Col. 3, lines 1-35; Col. 21, lines 52-65). It would be obvious that the multitasking application operates separate from the communications application since code for displaying the secondary information does not have to be the same code (Col. 33, lines 29-33) and both the communications application and multitasking application have separate windows (Col. 23, lines 33-65; Col. 37, lines 34-57).

As to claim 29, Slotznick teaches the step of automatically providing user notification comprises automatically switching focus back to the communications application (window/process displaying primary data) from the one of the multitasking applications (window/process displaying secondary information) (Col. 26, lines 5-17).

As to claim 30, SLOTZNICK teaches the steps of: detecting expiration of a predetermined period of time (preset time period) in which no user input has been received; and the step of switching focus back to the communications application (window/process displaying new primary data) is performed only after the step of detecting the expiration (Col. 21, lines 8-19).

As to claim 31, SLOTZNICK teaches the steps of: receiving user input selecting the communications application (user requesting a return to the primary data) after the notification

Art Unit: 2151

has been provided; and switching focus back to the communications application from the multi-tasking application in response to receipt of the user input (Col. 22, lines 37-54).

As to claim 32, SLOTZNICK teaches the steps of: identifying a previously utilized application (window/process displaying secondary data); and the step of automatically switching focus to the multitasking application comprises automatically switching focus to the previously utilized application (Col. 22, lines 37-54; Col. 23, lines 33-62). It would be obvious that since there can be more than one window holding secondary data (additional secondary data / screens) that one could be identified.

As to claim 33, refer to claim 32 for rejection. However, claim 33 details consulting a ring of applications. It would be obvious that since the user can request secondary data and there exist multiple secondary screens, that each secondary data is linked to another secondary data, the user is therefore consulting the windows or processes capable of displaying secondary data (Col. 22, lines 31-49; Col. 14, lines 15-17).

As to claim 34, SLOTZNICK teaches the step of automatically switching focus to the multi-tasking application (window/process displaying secondary data) is performed only if the link is determined to be a time-consuming link (link to request data from a remote source) (Col. 23, lines 33-62). It would be obvious that the focus is not switched to secondary data if new

Art Unit: 2151

information does not have to be retrieved but already cached, old information which is stored locally is requested (Col. 22, lines 37-54; Col. 23, lines 17-32).

As to claims 35-41, reference is made to a system which corresponds to the method of claims 28-34 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 28-34 above.

As to claims 42-48, reference is made to a program product which corresponds to the method of claims 28-34 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 28-34 above.

(11) Response to Argument

For the below reasons, it is believed that the rejection should be sustained.

First, Applicant characterizes that Slotznick is directed primarily towards a single application that displays multiple windows, particularly an enhanced Web browser capable of displaying "primary data" in one window while associated "secondary data" is being downloaded into another window (pg. 6, lines 19-24). The examiner disagrees with this characterization. Slotznick teaches that a program displaying primary information is swapped focus with a program displaying secondary information during interstitial time periods (col. 35, lines 1-37; col. 23, lines 33-54).

Applicant argues that nothing in Slotznick pertains to automatically swapping focus from the **Web browser** to another existing multi-tasking application (pg. 6, lines 15-26). The

Art Unit: 2151

examiner disagrees. The claim language states, "...automatically switching focus from said communications application to one of said multi-tasking applications, in response to initiating said link..." (Pg. 15, lines 11-13, claim 28). There is no limitation within the claims that the communications application is a Web browser. As stated in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures, the examiner is required to convey the broadest reasonable interpretation when examining the claims (M.P.E.P. 2111). It is interpreted that a communications application is simply an application capable of communicating and a multitasking application is an application executing simultaneously with other applications. Slotznick teaches two processes, displaying the trailer and getting new data occurring at the same time in separate windows wherein the trailer is displayed in the foreground while new data is retrieved and prepared in the background (col. 23, lines 33-53) and the trailer is automatically displayed during the user wait time between a user's request for some action to occur with respect to primary information and the time in which the subsequently requested primary information is available for display (col. 24, lines 10-15 col. 11, lines 22-24). Slotznick also teaches that windows are equated with applications (col. 3, lines 28-35) and that the windows are programs capable of displaying information (col. 34, lines 64-67; col. 35, lines 13-23). The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" states that an application is defined as a program or set of programs that enables people to use the computer as a tool to accomplish some task. It would be obvious that since Slotznick equates a window to a program for displaying information, and an application is a program then a window is considered an

Art Unit: 2151

application. For example, if A is equal to 4 and B is equal to 4, then A is equal to B.

Therefore, since the Slotznick teaches automatically displaying secondary information when a request for new primary information is sent and that windows are programs for displaying data, than Slotznick adequately discloses the limitation as claimed.

Applicant characterizes that the sections of Slotznick cited in the Final Office Action describe a browser application that utilizes multiple windows to display primary data and secondary data (pg. 6, lines 27-29). The examiner disagrees with this characterization. Slotznick teaches that a program displaying primary information is swapped focus with a program displaying secondary information during interstitial time periods (col. 35, lines 1-37; col. 23, lines 33-54).

Applicant argues that windows of Slotznick are not equated with applications of the present application and it is improper to equate windows and applications as they are not interchangeable concepts (pg. 6, line 29 - pg. 7, line 18). The examiner disagrees for a number of reasons. First, Slotznick teaches that windows are interchangeable with applications by stating that the practice also applies to applications (col. 3, lines 24-36). Secondly, The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" states that in a multitasking environment, each window can display output from a different program; and an application is defined as a program or set of programs that enables people to use the computer as a tool to accomplish some task. Therefore since Slotznick is a multitasking environment and both a window and an application are programs, then a window is an application. For

Art Unit: 2151

example, if A is equal to 4 and B is equal to 4, then A is equal to B. In addition, Slotznick also teaches that the windows are programs capable of displaying information (col. 34, lines 64-67; col. 35, lines 13-23). The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" states that an application is defined as a program or set of programs that enables people to use the computer as a tool to accomplish some task. It would be obvious that since Slotznick equates a window to a program for displaying information, and an application is a program then a window is considered an application. For example, if A is equal to 4 and B is equal to 4, then A is equal to B. Thirdly, Slotznick teaches that two processes, one displaying the trailer and the other getting new data occur at the same time wherein the trailer is displayed in the foreground while new data is retrieved in the background (col. 23, lines 37-40). The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" defines a process to be a program; and an application is defined as a program or set of programs. Therefore since both a process and application are programs, then a process is an application. For example, if A is equal to 4 and B is equal to 4, then A is equal to B.

Applicant argues that the examiner's assertion that the simultaneously executing two processes is incorrect and does not switch focus from a communications application to a another application (pg. 7, lines 19 - pg. 8, line 5). Applicant supports his argument by stating that the assertion fails to recognize that the two processes described in Slotznick are both part of the same application (pg. 7, lines 29-32). The examiner disagrees with the argument and the statement for a number of reasons. First, Slotznick does not explicitly

Art Unit: 2151

mention that the processes are both part of the same application as Applicant has characterized. Slotznick teaches their are two processes wherein one is retrieving and processing new data in the background and the other is displaying secondary data or trailer data in the foreground (col. 23, lines 34-40). The American Heritage Dictionary as explained above defines a process to be equivalent to an application, and therefore, Slotznick does teach switching focus from one application to another. Secondly, even if, for the sake of argument, the processes are part of the same application as Applicant has characterized, there is no limitation within the claims that restricts the cited applications from being part of a larger application. As stated in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures, the examiner is required to convey the broadest reasonable interpretation when examining the claims (M.P.E.P. 2111). The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" defines an application as **a program or set of programs**. Therefore an application can be a set of applications since an application is essentially a program. Thirdly, Slotznick teaches that the code for displaying the secondary information can be separate from other code (col. 34, lines 13-18). Therefore, since a process is equivalent to an application as defined by the American Heritage Dictionary and have separate code, then the two processes are separate applications. In addition, Slotznick equates the window as a program for displaying primary information or a program for displaying secondary information (col. 35, lines 1-38). The American Heritage Dictionary as explained above defines an application as a program. Therefore, a window is an application since both

Art Unit: 2151

are essentially programs. For example, if A is equal to 4 and B is equal to 4, then A is equal to B.

Applicant argues that the citation of column 33, lines 29-33 and col. 34, lines 13-26 in Slotznick do not teach the automatically switching focus among multiple concurrent applications (pg. 8, lines 6-27). The examiner disagrees. First, the cited sections include column 35, lines 1-35 wherein Slotznick teaches that a filter program is run to monitor interstitial time periods (the time after new data or processing is requested, until such data and/or processing has been completed and displayed) for a program displaying primary data such that it controls the display of a program displaying secondary information. Slotznick also teaches that one of the filter programs capability is to permit display of secondary information for a small amount of time (col. 35, lines 33-35) and that when the interstitial time period is over and the next primary information is ready to be displayed, the filter will allow that to be displayed, returning control of the screen and operating system to the program displaying the primary information (col. 35, lines 14-18). It is obvious that since the filter program allows secondary information to display and switches focus when interstitial time period is over, then it does teach switching focus among multiple concurrent applications.

Applicant has argued that lines 34-57 of column 7 do not teach swapping to an existing application as claimed, but instead relates to starting a new program (pg. 8, lines 28 - pg. 9, line 7). The examiner has not relied on column 7, lines 34-57, but column 37, lines 34-57 as stated in the final office action. Also, the examiner did not rely on such passage to teach the

Art Unit: 2151

swapping to an existing application as Applicant has characterized. The cited section teaches that the display of the primary and secondary data are separate and that secondary data is displayed when the request for new data is initiated by a link as cited in the claims. The examiner has demonstrated numerous sections within Slotznick above of teaching the swapping to an existing application.

Applicant has stated that the hyperlink and the corresponding JavaScript are intimately related, but then suggests that according to the present invention, the application that receives focus when a hyperlink is selected may be completely unrelated to that hyperlink (pg. 9, lines 7-11). However, the examiner cannot find any such limitation in the claims that the hyperlink is completely unrelated to the application receiving focus. As stated in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures, the examiner is required to convey the broadest reasonable interpretation when examining the claims (M.P.E.P. 2111).

Therefore, since Slotznick teaches all of the limitations and features of claim 28, the rejection should be sustained.

Applicant argued that Slotznick does not disclose or suggest “automatically switching focus back to said communications application” when the download is complete, but only if “no user input has been received” for “a predetermined period of time” (pg. 9, lines 17-24). Applicant supports such an argument by stating that since Slotznick never swaps focus away from the communications application, it can therefore not swap focus back to the communications application. The examiner disagrees with the argument and statement. In

Art Unit: 2151

response to Applicant's alleged statement, Slotznick does teach swapping focus away from the communications application as explained above. Slotznick teaches that while the data is being accessed in the background, the device displays the secondary data in the foreground and monitors whether there is any request for additional secondary data and after all requests are carried out the device then displays the new body of primary data that has been downloaded in the background (col. 23, line 55-col. 24, line 9). It is obvious that there must be user input in order to make any request for additional secondary data. Therefore, Slotznick does teach automatically switching focus back to the communications application since focus is returned back to displaying of the primary data after all requests are serviced.

Applicant argues that the Final Office Action citation of lines 8-19 of column 21 as teaching this feature makes no mention of user input (pg. 9, lines 25-31). Applicant supports this argument by characterizing the citation by stating that the communications application automatically removes the secondary information from the screen and replaces it with new primary information "after a preset period of time, provided that downloading of the new primary data is complete." (Pg. 9, lines 27-31) The examiner disagrees with the argument and Applicant's characterization. At the cited text, Slotznick teaches the secondary data is displayed for a predetermined period of time in which afterward the newly received primary data is then displayed. Slotznick also teaches that while the data is being accessed in the background, the device displays the secondary data in the foreground and monitors whether there is any request for additional secondary data and after all requests are carried out the

Art Unit: 2151

device then displays the new body of primary data that has been downloaded in the background (col. 23, line 55-col. 24, line 9). It is obvious that there must be user input in order to make any request for additional secondary data. Therefore, Slotznick does implicitly teach user input.

Applicant argues that the citation has nothing to do with swapping focus to the communication application from a different application (pg. 10, line 1-3). The examiner disagrees. It is interpreted that a communications application is simply an application capable of communicating and a multitasking application is an application executing simultaneously with other applications. The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" states that an application is defined as a program or set of programs that enables people to use the computer as a tool to accomplish some task. As explained above, Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus from the display of primary data to the display of secondary data wherein there exist a program capable of displaying and requesting primary data (col. 35, lines 14-23) and a program capable of displaying secondary data (col. 34, lines 13-18). Slotznick also teaches the secondary data is displayed for a predetermined period of time wherein the device monitors whether there is any request for additional secondary data and after all requests are carried out the device then displays the newly received primary data (col. 21, lines 8-19; col. 23, line 55-col. 24, line 9). Since the display of primary and secondary data is carried out by separate and different programs wherein the program for displaying primary data has the functionality to download information from a remote source thereby

Art Unit: 2151

invoking the other program to display secondary data and an application is by definition a program, then the program for displaying primary data is a communications application and the program for displaying secondary data is a multitasking application. Therefore, since Slotznick teaches that newly received primary data is displayed when there exist no request for secondary data and the information is completely downloaded (col. 21, lines 8-19; col. 23, line 55-col. 24, line 9), then Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus back to the communications application, hence the program capable of displaying primary information, from a different application, the program capable of displaying secondary information.

Applicant argues that the cited lines have nothing to do with “detecting expiration of a predetermined period of time in which no user input has been received.” (Pg. 10, lines 3-5).

The examiner disagrees. Slotznick teaches that while the data is being accessed in the background, the device displays the secondary data in the foreground and monitors whether there is any request for additional secondary data and after all requests are carried out the device then displays the new body of primary data that has been downloaded in the background (col. 23, line 55-col. 24, line 9). It is obvious that there must be user input in order to make any request for additional secondary data. Therefore, if no request is made then the primary information can be displayed.

Applicant argues that column 26, lines 5-18 do not teach swapping focus back to the communications application (pg. 10, lines 6-19). Applicant supports this argument by characterizing the citation. The examiner disagrees with the argument and Applicant's

Art Unit: 2151

characterization. It is interpreted that a communications application is simply an application capable of communicating and a multitasking application is an application executing simultaneously with other applications. The American Heritage Dictionaries "Dictionary of Computer Words" states that an application is defined as a program or set of programs that enables people to use the computer as a tool to accomplish some task. As explained above, Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus from the display of primary data to the display of secondary data wherein there exist a program capable of displaying and requesting primary data (col. 35, lines 14-23) and a program capable of displaying secondary data (col. 34, lines 13-18). At the cited lines, Slotznick teaches that the replacement of the display of secondary information with subsequently request primary information may occur as soon as the subsequently requested primary information is ready for display. Since the display of primary and secondary data is carried out by separate and different programs wherein the program for displaying primary data has the functionality to download information from a remote source thereby invoking the other program to display secondary data and an application is by definition a program, then the program for displaying primary data is a communications application and the program for displaying secondary data is a multitasking application. Therefore, since Slotznick teaches that newly received primary data is displayed when there exist no request for secondary data and the information is completely downloaded (col. 26, lines 5-18; col. 23, line 55-col. 24, line 9), then Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus back to the communications application, hence the program capable of displaying primary

Art Unit: 2151

information, from a different application, the program capable of displaying secondary information.

Therefore, since Slotznick teaches all of the limitations and features of claim 30, the rejection should be sustained.

Applicant argues that Slotznick neither discloses nor suggests the concepts of “a ring of applications” or a “selected application among said ring”, let alone implementing the functionality of claim 33 (pg. 11, lines 4-7). The examiner disagrees. As explained above, Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus from the display of primary data to the display of secondary data wherein there exist a program capable of displaying and requesting primary data (col. 35, lines 14-23) and a program capable of displaying secondary data (col. 34, lines 13-18). Slotznick also teaches that the memory cache may store a number of secondary information screens linked with the primary information in a variety of ways (col. 14, lines 15-17) wherein the quantum of secondary information may automatically return the user to the primary information after a set time period (col. 14, lines 23-32). A screen is another name for a window. As explained above, a window is considered an application, therefore a screen is an application. Since there are multiple screens of secondary information there exist multiple programs capable of displaying this secondary information and since these programs are swapping focus back and forth with the program capable of displaying primary information (Slotznick, col. 14, lines 23-32), these programs must be a ring of applications as defined in the specification. Slotznick also teaches the full image of secondary information may be

Art Unit: 2151

directly requested by the user by pressing or clicking a control or button (col. 28, lines 25-27). Therefore, since there exist multiple programs capable of displaying secondary information and a user can directly request the secondary information from the program capable of displaying primary information, then an application is selected from the ring. The claim language of claim 33 states the steps of consulting a ring of applications to identify a selected application, and the step of automatically switching focus comprises automatically switching focus to the identified application. In order to identify an application from a list of a plurality of applications one has to consult the list. As explained above, Slotznick teaches a ring of applications and the identification of a selected application. Slotznick also teaches if the user requests subsequent primary information, the full image of secondary information may be displayed (**or redisplayed**) (col. 28, lines 30-33). Therefore, Slotznick teaches that focus is swapped to redisplay an identified secondary information when new primary information is requested and meets all limitations of claim 33.

Applicant argues that the citation of the Final Office Action do not have anything to do with identifying an application that is listed in a ring of applications, and “selected in that ring (pg. 11, lines 8-24). The examiner disagree. As explained above, Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus from the display of primary data to the display of secondary data wherein there exist a program capable of displaying and requesting primary data (col. 35, lines 14-23) and a program capable of displaying secondary data (col. 34, lines 13-18). Slotznick also teaches that the memory cache may store a number of secondary information screens

Art Unit: 2151

linked with the primary information in a variety of ways (col. 14, lines 15-17) wherein the quantum of secondary information may automatically return the user to the primary information after a set time period (col. 14, lines 23-32). A screen is another name for a window. As explained above, a window is considered an application, therefore a screen is an application. Since there are multiple screens of secondary information there exist multiple programs capable of displaying this secondary information and since these programs are swapping focus back and forth with the program capable of displaying primary information (Slotznick, col. 14, lines 23-32), these programs must be a ring of applications as defined in the specification. Slotznick also teaches the full image of secondary information may be directly requested by the user by pressing or clicking a control or button (col. 28, lines 25-27). Therefore, since there exist multiple programs capable of displaying secondary information and a user can directly request the secondary information from the program capable of displaying primary information, then an application is selected from the ring. The claim language of claim 33 states the steps of consulting a ring of applications to identify a selected application, and the step of automatically switching focus comprises automatically switching focus to the identified application. In order to identify an application from a list of a plurality of applications one has to consult the list. As explained above, Slotznick teaches a ring of applications and the identification of a selected application. Slotznick also teaches if the user requests subsequent primary information, the full image of secondary information may be displayed (**or redisplayed**) (col. 28, lines 30-33). Therefore, Slotznick teaches that focus is

Art Unit: 2151

swapped to redisplay an identified secondary information when new primary information is requested and meets all limitations of claim 33.

Applicant characterizes that claim 33 recites that the step of identifying is made in further consideration of whether a “selected application among said ring” is also a currently active multi-tasking application. However, there cannot be found any such claim language that makes consideration on a selected application. As stated in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures, the examiner is required to convey the broadest reasonable interpretation when examining the claims (M.P.E.P. 2111).

Applicant argues that Slotznick has nothing to do with switching focus from the communications application to a different, currently active multi-tasking application and therefore does not suggest consulting a ring of applications to identify and automatically switch to a selected application (pg. 11, line 29 - pg. 12, line 4). The examiner disagrees. As explained above, Slotznick adequately teaches swapping focus from the display of primary data to the display of secondary data wherein there exist a program capable of displaying and requesting primary data (col. 35, lines 14-23) and a program capable of displaying secondary data (col. 34, lines 13-18). Slotznick also teaches that the memory cache may store a number of secondary information screens linked with the primary information in a variety of ways (col. 14, lines 15-17) wherein the quantum of secondary information may automatically return the user to the primary information after a set time period (col. 14, lines 23-32). A screen is another name for a window. As explained above, a window is considered an application,

Art Unit: 2151

therefore a screen is an application. Since there are multiple screens of secondary information there exist multiple programs capable of displaying this secondary information and since these programs are swapping focus back and forth with the program capable of displaying primary information (Slotznick, col. 14, lines 23-32), these programs must be a ring of applications as defined in the specification. Slotznick also teaches the full image of secondary information may be directly requested by the user by pressing or clicking a control or button (col. 28, lines 25-27). Therefore, since there exist multiple programs capable of displaying secondary information and a user can directly request the secondary information from the program capable of displaying primary information, then an application is selected from the ring. The claim language of claim 33 states the steps of consulting a ring of applications to identify a selected application, and the step of automatically switching focus comprises automatically switching focus to the identified application. In order to identify an application from a list of a plurality of applications one has to consult the list. As explained above, Slotznick teaches a ring of applications and the identification of a selected application. Slotznick also teaches if the user requests subsequent primary information, the full image of secondary information may be displayed (**or redisplayed**) (col. 28, lines 30-33). Therefore, Slotznick teaches that focus is swapped to redisplay an identified secondary information when new primary information is requested and meets all limitations of claim 33.

Applicant characterizes column 23, line 33 through column 24, line 9 of Slotznick (pg. 12, lines 5-13). The examiner disagrees with this characterization. Slotznick teaches two

Art Unit: 2151

processes, displaying the trailer and getting new data occur at the same time: the trailer is displayed in the foreground while new data is retrieved and prepared in the background.

Applicant argues that Slotznick does not teach a ring of applications or utilizing a ring to identify a currently active multitasking application (pg. 12, lines 20-30). Applicant also states that Claim 33 does not involve storing keyhole images, or a simple list. The examiner disagrees with the argument and the statements. Applicant has defined a ring of applications as options list 240 of Figure 8 of the present specification where a user can select an application. Slotznick teaches keyhole images on a web page wherein a user can request new primary data and automatically display a full display of secondary data, or a specific secondary data directly (col. 29, line 62- col. 30, line 3; col. 14, lines 12-15). It is obvious that since the keyhole images are stored in a list on the primary screen and when selected by a user, enable display of secondary data, then they are a ring of applications as defined in the specification. Therefore, Slotznick does teach a ring of applications and selecting of an identified application.

Therefore, since Slotznick teaches all of the limitations and features of claim 33, the rejection should be sustained.

Art Unit: 2151

In conclusion, Applicant's primary argument is whether Slotznick teaches switching focus from a communications application to a multitasking application. It is the examiner's position that the prior art teachings of Slotznick adequately teaches this concept as explained above.

Respectfully submitted,

Majid Banankhah
MAJID BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

STJL
CONFERENCE

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. , *lab*

January 9, 2001

lab